

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2. In Fig. 2, the arbiters A11, A11, A11 have been changed to the arbiters A11, A12, A13.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet
 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6-27 remain in the application. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 12-16, 18-19, 21-22, and 25-27 have been amended. Claims 5 and 28 have been cancelled.

In item 1 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the drawings have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "A11" has been used to designate A11, A12, and A13 in Fig. 2. Appropriate correction has been made.

In item 2 on pages 2-3 of the above-identified Office action, the drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the Read and Write timing must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s). The features of read and write timing have been deleted from claim 1.

In item 4 on pages 3-5 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-17, 19-20, and 27-28 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Hiller et al. (5,081,575) in view of Khandekar et al. (US 6,173,354) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In item 5 on page 6 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 8, 12-13, 18, and 21-26 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Hiller et al. in view of Khandekar et al. and further in view of Hanawa et al. (US 5,173,354) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejections have been noted and claims 1 and 27 have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found on page 23, line 18 to page 24, line 16 of the specification as well as in Fig. 1.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

a multiplexer associated with each of said at least one first device, said multiplexer associated with each of said at least one first device having input connections connecting to all of said at least one second device and an output connection connecting to the respective one of said at least one first device;

an arbiter associated with each of said at least one second device, said arbiter having input connections connecting to all of said at least one first device and an output connection connecting to the respective one of said at least one second device; and

a multiplexer associated with each of said at least one second device, said multiplexer associated with each of said at least one second device having input connections connecting to all of said at least one first device and an output connection connecting to the respective one of said at least one second device.

Claim 27 calls for, inter alia:

associating a multiplexer with each of the at least one first device, the multiplexer associated with each of the at least one first device having input connections connecting to all of the at least one second device and an output connection connecting to the respective one of the at least one first device;

associating an arbiter with each of the at least one second device, the arbiter having input connections connecting to all of the at least one first device and an output connection connecting to the respective one of the at least one second device;

associating a multiplexer with each of the at least one second device, the multiplexer associated with each of the at least one second device having input connections connecting to all of the at least one first device and an output connection connecting to the respective one of the at least one second device.

None of the cited references discloses a multiplexer associated with each of the at least one first device, which has input connections connecting to all of the at least one second device and an output connection connecting to the respective one of the at least one first device, an arbiter associated with each of the at least one second device, which

has input connections connecting to all of the at least one first device and an output connection connecting to the respective one of the at least one second device, and a multiplexer associated with each of the at least one second device, which has input connections connecting to all of the at least one first device and an output connection connecting to the respective one of the at least one second device, as recited in claims 1 and 27 of the instant application. This configuration can be implemented and operated in a simple manner, allowing the devices that are connected to one another through the cross bar to cooperate efficiently, and to be combined in a flexible manner (see page 37, lines 19-22 of the specification).


It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 and 27. Claims 1 and 27 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-27 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicants

LAURENCE A. GREENBERG
REG. NO. 29.308

YC

December 29, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101

